



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

70
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/821,584	03/29/2001	James F. Riordan	CH920000010US1	3499
48813	7590	06/22/2007	EXAMINER	
LAW OFFICE OF IDO TUCHMAN (YOR) 82-70 BEVERLY ROAD KEW GARDENS, NY 11415			PYZOWCHA, MICHAEL J	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2137				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/22/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/821,584	RIORDAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael Pyzocha	2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 April 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 30-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 30-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

Art Unit: 2137

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 30-38 are pending.
2. Pre-Brief Appeal Conference request has been received and considered. Prosecution is hereby reopened.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 30-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boroughs et al. (US 6834350) in view of Riordan et al. (Target Naming and Service Apoptosis).

As per claims 30 and 33, Boroughs et al. discloses a security system comprising: an activation token identifying system characteristics and specifying a threat and at least one preset activation measure, wherein a system characteristic is one of the group of a hardware system, a service, a configuration of a service, a service execution platform, and a service session (see column 2 line 62 through column 3 line 34);

Art Unit: 2137

a first system configured to at least review security and vulnerability information from information publishers and to provide the activation token based on filtered security and vulnerability information (see column 2 line 59 through column 3 line 10); and a second system configured to determine whether the activation token is relevant by checking if actual characteristics at the second system correspond to the system characteristics identified by the activation token, the second system further configured to transform the activation token into at least one activation measure if the activation token is considered relevant by the second system the activation measure configured to modify services executing at the second system (see column 3 lines 35-67 and column 4 lines 1-5) wherein the first system is further configured to automatically filter the security and vulnerability information relevant to the system characteristics identified by the activation token (see column 2 line 59 through column 3 line 10 and Figure 17).

Boroughs et al. fail to explicitly disclose including a threat level within the activation token.

However, Riordan et al. teaches including a trust level (as well as system characteristics) with an activation token (see page 220).

Art Unit: 2137

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include trust levels with the activation tokens of Boroughs et al.

Motivation to do so would have been to distinguish between the severities of threats (see page 220).

As per claim 31, the modified Boroughs et al. and Riordan et al. system discloses cryptographic means configured to verify at the second system that the first system is a trusted service (see Boroughs et al. column 3 lines 55-67 and Riordan et al. pages 220 and 223).

As per claim 32, the modified Boroughs et al. and Riordan et al. system discloses reporting means configured to report to a system administrator of the second system any activation measure taken by the second system (see Riordan et al. page 223 and Boroughs et al. column 2 lines 59-67).

As per claim 34, the modified Boroughs et al. and Riordan et al. system discloses a list of trusted service providers from whom activation tokens are accepted by the second system (see Riordan et al. page 222).

As per claims 35-38, the modified Boroughs et al. and Riordan et al. system discloses a preset activation measure is one of shutting down a service affected by the specified threat level, reconfiguration of the service, installing a patch for

Art Unit: 2137

the service and altering a system administrator (see Riordan et al. page 223).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 30-38 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Fieres, Todd, Dodd, Antur, Norris, and Denker teach methods of providing activation tokens based on vulnerabilities or threats.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Pyzocha whose telephone number is (571) 272-3875. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00am - 4:30pm first Fridays of the bi-week off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2137

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MJP



EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER